

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,345	06/23/2003	Andres F. Zuluaga	12258-029001	. 1603
<sup>26161</sup> FISH & RICH	590 01/23/2008 R DSON PC		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## 

2) applicant's representative

e) No.

Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Hayes (US Patent No. 4,967,745)</u>.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2007.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21,43-51 and 53-61.

Type: a)  $\boxtimes$  Telephonic b)  $\square$  Video Conference

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes

c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant requested clarification of how the probe of Hayes ('745) is capable of "resiliently assuming a preferred shape" as currently recited by the instant claims. Examiner reiterated that the limitation of "resiliently assuming a preferred shape" is met by any cardiovascular probe that includes pull wires (as Hayes does), is capable of receiving guidewires or stylets, or is capable of being delivered to the target site via a catheter or cannula. Examiner recommended that Applicant amend the independent claim to definitively recite the specific structures which cause it to "resiliently assume a preferred shape" in an effort to overcome Hayes ('745), however Applicant stated that the inventive probe acheives this feature merely by being made of a "springy material," and that there is no specific distinguishing material or component disclosed in the specification that can be cited by the claim to distinguish over the prior art of record. Examiner again encourages Applicant to amend the claim language to recite in a more detailed and specific recitation the features which he considers to be novel and patentable, which, during the previous interview of Augus 2007, appeared to be the optical window feature.